different hours and as separate congregations. Now that they are spatially nearer to each other, there are at least some of them who are hopeful of union. We must admit that there is wisdom to this madness, especially in these days of economic stress. If churches must divide, perhaps they can work out a plan to use the same building. They could toss a coin (or roll dice!) to see who would get the sacred hours of 11 a.m. on Sunday and 7 p.m. Wednesday.

We invite any of our readers to join us in special meetings during June. With Ouida at my side this time since we are driving, I will be with the College Church of Christ, Conway, Arkansas, June 13-15. Contact Robert L. Ott, Rt. 5. June 21 I will be in the home of J. Dwight Thomas, Ridgeway Dr., Hillsdale Est., Elizabethtown, Ky., and the next day and until June 28 I will be with the Highland Church of Christ, Louisville, Ky. Contact Ernest Lyon, 2629 Valletta Rd. This provides opportunity to meet folk that otherwise I might never meet.

Dave Reagan, recently minister to the Central Church of Christ in Irving, Texas, has begun an independent prophetic ministry called Lamb and Lion Ministries. He will be on call for studies in prophecy, believing this to be a neglected area of study, and you may contact him at 2706 Clear Springs, Plano, Tx. 75075. The ministry is conducted by a board representing several denominations.

A few months back Hans Kung, Roman Catholic theologian in Tubingen, Germany, was censured by the Sacred Congregation in Rome and defrocked as a theologian of that denomination. The charge was that he had departed from "the integral truth of Catholic faith." His response to this was recently published in the *New York Times* under the title *Why I Remain a Catholic.* He affirms that he is a faithful Catholic because of his awareness of being united with the whole church, the church of all times, and he cautions that everything that is officially taught as Catholic is not truly Catholic. Referring to the "mass withdrawal" from the Roman church, he predicts that it will continue. Since his chair at Tubingen is not controlled by the hierarchy he will not relinquish his position. The censuring of the popular theologian has had its repercussions. The Harvard Divinity School faculty, for example, issued a protest to Rome.

If this little journal is meaningful to you, it might be to some of your friends. In clubs of five or more the rate is only 2.00 per name per year, new or renewal.

At the suggestion of a reader we are now informing you by way of a hand stamp a month in advance of your expiration date. The stamp reads *Your Sub. Expires Next Issue. Please Renew at Once.*

If you do not renew, another hand stamp will inform you on the next month's issue that *Your Sub. Expires With This Issue. Please Renew at Once.* We hope you heed the first notice, but if you disregard them both, we will assume that you do not opt to continue as a reader and will remove your name. But you can renew or extend your sub anytime, such as when you send in a club.

Cecil Hook
1550 Hulsache
New Braunfels TX 78130

RESTORATION REVIEW

Who Is A Christian?

Whoever acknowledges the leading truths of Christianity, and conforms his life to that acknowledgement, we esteem a Christian. — *Barton W. Stone*

A Christian is one that habitually believes all that Christ says, and habitually does all that he bids him. — *Alexander Campbell*

Vol 22, No. 5 Leroy Garrett, Editor May, 1980

With All Your Mind. . .

THE IDOLS OF THE MIND

The renaissance, which followed the medieval age and embraced the 15th and 16th centuries, was the beginning of a new way of thinking. The monks and scholastics may have had "religious" minds, but their thinking was vertical with almost no horizontal lines, which is to say that they thought only (in a very philosophical way) of man's relation to God with little thought of how this applied to his dealings with his fellows. So, the renaissance gave birth to a *critical* way of thinking about man and his problems, and about the world in which he lived. Thus the sciences were born, both the physical sciences and the social sciences.

The medievalists not only thought only vertically but also deductively and subjectively, which means that they built sytems of philosophy around *assumed* truths. They canonized Aristotle's syllogism and supposed that all truth could be ascertained by piling up deductions. The renaissance, especially in the person of Francis Bacon, who has come to be known as "the father of induction," gave the world a new way of thinking. Rather than setting up premises, which for centuries were presumed to be true, and drawing conclusions therefrom, Bacon insisted that no conclusion should be drawn for which there is not sufficient *observable* evidence. Thus emerged what John Locke later called "historical plain method," the method of study adopted by our own Alexander Campbell in his approach to Scripture.

In his debate with Owen, Campbell said: "Everything is to be submitted to the most minute observation. No conclusions are to be drawn from guesses or conjectures. We are to keep within the limits of experimental truth." It is noteworthy that he was then quoting from the great John Newton, "the father of modern science." Campbell went on to say to Mr. Owen: "We first ascertain the facts, then group them together, and after the classification and comparison of them, draw the conclusion."

This was the beginning of the *inductive* study of the Bible in our own history, a tradition to which we have been less than faithful, for many of our most cherished doctrines are deductively assumed rather than inductively proved.

Hear Campbell in his challenge to Owen, giving the basis of his own

Address all mail to: 1201 Windsor Drive, Denton, Tx. 76201

RESTORATION REVIEW is published monthly, except July and August, at 1201 Windsor Drive, Denton, Texas. Entered as second class mail, Denton, Tx. SUBSCRIPTION RATES: $4.00 a year, or two years for $7.00; in clubs of five or more (mailed by us to separate addresses) $2.00 per name per year. (USPS 044450). POSTMASTER: Send address changes to RESTORATION REVIEW, 1201 Windsor Dr., Denton, Tx. 76201.

plea: "Any argument, therefore, which we may offer, we wish examined by the improved principles of inductive philosophy, by those very principles which right reason and sound experimental philosophy have sanctioned as their appropriate tests."

The old reformer laid down a rule in this context that we would do well to ponder in our day: *Our faith in any given conclusion is to be determined by the evidence that supports it.* How strong is the evidence from Scripture? It is a rule that would embarrass many of our assumptions, especially those that are unique to our own background and hardly believed by any other church in the world. Unique views nearly always come under the judgment of an inductive study of the Bible. This means that people go to Scripture, not with their minds already made up, but to gather facts, and then let the *facts*, only the facts, determine the conclusions drawn.

Drawing on Francis Bacon, Campbell said: "All true and useful knowledge is an acquaintance with facts." This was the renaissance approach to the whole of human knowledge and it gave birth to a new kind of world, now called the nuclear age. It was also a new way of studying the Bible. When Campbell developed this method in his own study it was as revolutionary as the way Copernicus, Kepler, and Galileo, other renaissance figures, looked at the universe. When Galileo *tested* the Aristotelian deduction that heavier objects fall faster than lighter ones by dropping such objects from the tower of Pisa, professors at the nearby university, who watched with their own eyes, declared that some demonic force held back the heavier object. When the clergy on the frontier heard Campbell explain the Bible *inductively*, such as in his Sermon on the Law, it was so shocking to their theological ears that they were set upon doing him in.

This method, which in our shallow sectarianism we have all but ignored, would be almost as startling to us. Just to mention a few assumptions that could be questioned: how strong is the evidence *in Scripture* that tongues have ceased? or that a collection is to be taken only on the first day of the week? or that money becomes "the Lord's money" when it is put into "the church treasury"? or that singing can be only acappella? or that there is *congregational* singing to start with? or that immersion is essential to salvation? or that drinking *per se* is a sin?

There is a vast difference between going to Scripture for prooftexts for conclusions already drawn (deduction) and going in search of *facts* that demand their own conclusion (induction). Campbell went so far as to suggest that we should reach no conclusion but what the evidence of Scripture forces upon us. If our various parties followed that dictum, what a glorious change would be wrought in our lives. The truth is that we often force Scripture into our own narrow, sectarian mold.

Campbell insisted that "All revealed religion is based upon facts," and again drawing on Bacon's inductive logic he insisted that a fact is something said or done. God has *spoken* and *acted,* thus revealing himself through His chosen envoys. Thus *revealed* religion. We can know nothing of God's will for us except in terms of facts. This is why unity and fellowship can never be based upon our own opinions or deductions, but only on facts, such as Jesus Christ is the Son of God. The gospel is made up only of facts, what God has said or done in history. Mystical experiences, dreams, imagination, and all the rest of subjectivism mean little, for they are unreliable in that they are based on fancy rather than facts. "In many and various ways God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets; but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son," says Heb. 1:1-2 and I buy it. I am not so sure when brethren tell me God said this to them or that to them or that the Spirit directed them to do this or the other.

Our own vain imaginations (Rom. 1:21) are related to a lot of fallacies. There are four in particular to be mentioned here, called "Idols of the Mind" by Francis Bacon, which he saw as devastating to one's search for truth in that they blind people to facts. The first one, Idols of the Tribe, stem from the sluggish mind that is satisfied and too lazy to think, and that accepts those things that support its superstitions and traditions. Bacon saw that it is difficult for people to think critically about their own heritage, tribe, nation, or culture. We might call this fallacy idols *of the party,* where ideas and practices are made sacrosanct by use and because "We've always done it that way." This often blinds us to improvement and new truths.

The second idol of the mind is Idols of the Cave, which are the fallacies of our own individual mind apart from the tribe or rest of society. We all have a cave or den of our own, Bacon contended, and we often defend it against any invasion of new ideas. We don't want to be disturbed by facts. I know a brother who is convinced that another brother made a play for his wife, and he continues to use this as an excuse for not going to the assembly. I know the parties well and know that he is wrong and only uses this as a coverup for his own failure to make peace with God. He knows it too if he would be honest, but he has this myth securely entrenched in the dark cave of his own mind, ready to be used as a defense mechanism when needed. I know others who are really turned on to the Spirit, so they tell us, but in their private lives their relationship with others, even their own families, is in such disrepair that one can only conclude that they are playing a game, thus avoiding any real confrontation with God. They hide in the cave of their own mind.

Then there are Idols of the Marketplace, fallacies in conversation and communication. Bacon recognized that for various reasons we are not

really hearing one another. Either we do not say what we mean or our ideas are confused in our own minds. Words often mean different things to different people. Disagreements are often only verbal, so that if it were clear to all parties what a term is made to mean there might be agreement. Socrates was a master in dealing with marketplace foibles. He was always asking for definitions. We might do that in the controversy over verbal inspiration, unity-in-diversity, and liberalism. What do these terms really mean?

Lastly, Idols of the Theater result from the dogmas of philosophers and theologians. In our day Bacon might add TV, for he saw people ignoring their real world and living by the values of a make-believe world. The theater is gilded and artificial. We make life a theater when we play games and deceive ourselves.

Bacon saw the mind as a mirror that must be kept clean and polished so that it can properly reflect truth when it is exposed to it. This is to say again that the mind matters, certainly for the Christian. — *the Editor*

THE REAL DIFFERENCE

During my rather long tenure as an editor among a divided religious people I have sought an answer to a perplexing problem: *what is the real difference between people?* I say *real* because I am suspicious that the presumed differences are superficial. I belong to a heritage that began as a unity movement, and yet the heirs of that movement are scandalously divided a dozen or more different ways. I say *scandalous* because it can be nothing less when disciples of Jesus are led to be ugly to each other. Why is it so? Are the differences really theological or doctrinal as they appear to be? Do we go our separate ways, often with an uncharitable attitude, because we differ on methods of evangelizing (societies and sponsoring churches), teaching (literature and Sunday Schools) or corporate worship (organs, multiple cups, etc.) or is it something more basic?

I am not talking about separation as such, for people may be apart and still treat each other with Christian dignity. Nor am I talking about merely seeing things differently, for this is unavoidable among people with any freedom at all. I am referring to that ever-present inclination among us to reject other Christians as equal to ourselves, and this includes those of our own historic heritage, even those in other Churches of Christ. Let's put it plainly: it is common practice among us to divide into sects that hate each other. If you are an *anti* or a *liberal* or a *premill* or a *charismatic,* not to name them all, you are held in disdain by not a few among us. How scandalous for Christians to hate each other! But why?

I have for years been an observer (and at one time a *participant,* I regretfully add) of this kind of behavior. It is clearly a *them* and *us* kind of thing. Lines are drawn and motives are impugned. If you are on the wrong side, you can do nothing right; if you are on the right side, you can do nothing wrong (nothing really serious, at least). If you belong to "us", the best possible interpretation is put upon what you do or say; if you belong to "them", you are surely up to something even when your conduct appears to be noble.

This "difference" between folk is manifest in sundry ways, and I am interested in what is *really* going on. Some of our folk go bananas if you start asking questions, while others remain cool no matter what you ask. The bare mention of some people's names (the controversial souls among us) drive a lot of our folk up the wall, while others are unruffled even if you tell them that one of those people is waiting to see them. Some have all sorts of "keep off the grass" signs distributed through their mind, while others are open to new ideas and esperiences. Some are loving and gracious even in the face of cruel criticism, while others are vindictive and discourteous even to the most innocent. Some are pliable and teachable, even child-like, while others are implacable and boorish, even childish.

The *real* difference?

I am persuaded that we are talking about two different kinds of love, or objects of love: a love for the party on one hand and a love for Jesus on the other. That may sound like oversimplifiation, but it really isn't all that simple. We are all motivated by what we love, and this in turn is related to our whole psyche. We all need to feel secure, even if we have to rely on false security. We love that which gives us security, and we tend to both hate and destroy that which threatens it.

I see these same people I have described make dramatic changes. Occasionally one of them will admit that he once hated me, but now he loves me, and he can really say, *I love you!,* which is of course his victory, not mine. What has really happened? Not that he now agrees with me all that much or that he has made a doctrinal turnaround. He now loves Jesus, and that makes all the difference in the world. When he hated me it was because he considered me a threat to his party and pet doctrines. Now that he loves Jesus rather than the party he can love his sisters and brothers, even cantankerous ones like me. This is the big difference. When one loves the party he must hate anything that gets in its way, for the party, by its very sectarian nature, has to be exactly right.

This difference is apparent enough in scripture. The Jewish hierarchy had no major differences with Jesus in reference to his teaching, for it was not all that different from what the rabbis had always taught. So why did they hate him so intensely? He was not a party man. Moreover he freed people from the hold the Pharisees had over them. The party must control

people's minds, and it must destroy anyone who threatens that control. It wasn't so much what the Lord taught, but it was the direction that he gave it — *to set men free.* So the difference, the *real* difference, between Jesus and the Pharisees is that Jesus loved God and the Pharisees loved their party.

John 12:42-43 gives a clear picture: "Nevertheless many even of the rulers believed in Him, but because of the Pharisees they were not confessing Him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue; for they loved the approval of men rather than the approval of God."

And, believe it, that is the difference between Christians today, far more than doctrinal diversity. We could become a united people in Jesus Christ, loving each other and working together, if it were not for the fact that many love the party more than they love Jesus. It is often a matter of fear, a fear of what the party might do to them. It takes a certain kind of person who has no fear of being put out of the synagogue or kicked out of church. That person has conquered his pride by fixing his eyes upon Jesus, "the author and perfecter of our faith." Yes, of course, it hurts to be rejected by our own people, especially if our eyes are fixed other than on Jesus. No party can hurt our pride if our pride is already crucified with Christ, and "It is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me" (Gal. 2:20).

One of the most sobering truths announced by the prophets of the coming Messiah was that "He was despised and rejected by men" (Isa. 53:3). Few of his disciples seem willing to follow him in this respect. Even his chosen envoys fled when that dark hour came that he was to be crucified. That is an awesome line that reads: *They all forsook him and fled* (Mk. 15:50). Dare we ask ourselves if we would have done otherwise had we been there? If today we put party or denominational loyalty before Jesus (and those who love Jesus) it is not likely that we would have stood by him then.

The apostle accepts the fact that if a believer is truly a child of the free woman (Sarah) and not of the slave woman (Hagar) she will be persecuted. As he put it in Gal. 4:29: "He who was born according to the flesh persecuted him who was born according to the Spirit." He adds the foreboding touch: *So it is now.*

It is a lesson we are slow to learn. All over the country I minister to folk who have been pushed around or kicked out or both. They are always surprised that their own brethren would treat them in such a manner. But we have been amply warned. Just as Ishmael gave Isaac a hard time, so we today, if we are "born according to the Spirit," will be browbeaten by those who are *carnal* Christians, and nothing is more carnal than sectarianism.

This big difference is in every church. There are those who are crucified with Christ and who love him with heart, mind, and soul.

with them in spirit if not outwardly. "Parties, factions, and divisions," which are listed in Gal. 5:20 as works of flesh, would cease if we were all like that "remnant" in every church.

But there are also those who choose to be children of Hagar by loving what *they* have created rather than what Jesus has created. When these find that Sarah's children are different, they proceed to give them a hard time, and finally drive them out. One young brother, who came to Jesus from the sub-culture of Hippie-dom, told me how he asked his Church of Christ brethren why he had such difficulty being accepted. One was candid enough to tell him, *You are different from us.* It was a revealing admission.

The party wants them white, middle-class, conforming, and of course dressed right (shaven and with a haircut). Equally important is that one not think, certainly not seriously and critically, and he is not to go around asking a lot of questions. In most churches it spells trouble to be really converted to Jesus. If you love him who first loved us rather than the party, which only *uses* us, you are likely to have a hard time of it. *So it is now!*, Paul says. Sectarian Christians always persecute spiritual Christians.

There is good news in all this. Not only that those who keep their eyes on Jesus will gain the victory, but that anyone who is party-minded rather than Christ-minded does not have to remain that way. In that same Gal. 4 Paul refers to the Jerusalem above as our mother. Rather than loving the party one can be adopted by *that* parent and be free in Christ. What a glorious blessing! Thank God that we don't have to remain sectarians! — *the Editor*

Highlights in Restoration History . . .

OUR FATHERS ON "WHO IS A CHRISTIAN?"

In recent years I have come to view that question *Who is a Christian?* as somewhat loaded, for as often as not it is calculated to force one into a corner and to demand of him a list of particulars. One hardly ever asks *Who is a disciple?*, and perhaps it is a better question. It is also more Biblical, for *Christian* only appears three times and is never defined. Whereas *disciple* appears often and is defined by Jesus when he says: "By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you have love one for another" (Jn. 13:35), and he even identifies the disciple *indeed*: "If you continue in my word, then are you my disciples indeed" (Jn. 8:31).

Did anyone ever ask you who is a Christian *indeed?*

I never recall being asked *Who is a disciple?* Everyone seems to know that a disciple is a learner or follower. It is simple and uncomplicated, while *Christian* is made more technical, and (in our circles at least) more exact. We have those among us who would grant that one may be a disciple who is not a Christian. This is where it gets sticky, and it says something about us when we hesitate to be specific about when one is a disciple but most punctiliar as to when he is a Christian.

You may be aware that Alexander Campbell and Barton W. Stone disagreed on the name that should grace the Movement they began. Stone was certain that Acts 11:26 ("the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch") reveals a God-given name, while Campbell was equally convinced that it was a nickname. The Bethany sage noted that it was strange that Luke the historian never himself used that name in identifying the disciples, if indeed it was God-given. And he reminded Stone that a believer never in the New Testament calls himself a Christian, nor does a believer ever call another believer a Christian. Disciples, of course, along with other appellations, are all over the place. The two founding fathers resolved the issue by using both names, and it is remarkable how churches across the country actually had two names (if not three) and were known by the community by both names, Disciples of Christ and Christian Church (or Church of Christ).

We in Churches of Christ make little use of *disciple*, strongly preferring *Christian*, though, strangely enough, *not* Christian Church. Perhaps *disciple* is too generic, too broad. Yet one wonders why, in the light of Scripture, we could not all unite on being *disciples of Christ,* with or without the capital *D. Disciple* is defined in Scripture, *Christian* is not. If you accept one as a disciple of Jesus Christ, then you should be able to work and worship with him. If not, why not?

I am tempted to respond to the oft-asked question as to who is a Christian by noting that it is hardly a Biblical question, for there is not sufficient data to come up with a solid answer. A king told an apostle that he was almost persuaded to be a Christian, but that apostle in responding seemed to have deliberately avoided using the term (Acts 26:28-29). One is left to wonder if Paul ever applied the term to himself — or to any other believer for that matter. But another apostle, while he never calls believers by that name, nonetheless insisted that they should glorify God in that name (1 Pet. 4:16). There is no question, however, as to who a disciple is, for there are several clear-cut answers, John 15:8 being still another: "By this is my Father glorified, that you bear much fruit; so shall you be my disciples."

But even if there is ambiguity in regard to this name, I agree with Barton Stone when he complained to Campbell, *Who can possibly object to the name Christian?* Campbell did not object to it, but only thought

disciple to be more appropriate and Biblical. We should all be willing to go along with Peter, whether the name originated in the mouths of our enemies or not, and glorify God in this name. But for those who are tempted to give an ironclad, arbitrary definition of the term are to be reminded that any definition at all is one's own deduction and therefore only an opinion. I personally deduce that *Christian* must mean the same as *disciple,* nothing more nor less. This is why I cannot say that one *must* be immersed to be a Christian, for I do not believe that one has to be immersed to be a disciple. A true disciple obeys Jesus *insofar as he understands.* I would say the same for a true Christian, but I have lots of brethren who disagree with me. They would agree that a disciple might be unimmersed, but not a Christian! That is why I say if we could avoid anything like a *technical* definition of the name and think more in terms of the meaning of discipleship, it might help. And it just might be more Biblical!

In referring to the controversy between Stone and Campbell, I should add that they both came up with a definition of a Christian. It may prove enlightening to take a look, for their deductions not only grew out of long years of study but amidst conflict as well.

"Whoever acknowledges the leading truths of Christianity, and conforms his life to that acknowledgment, we esteem a Christian," wrote Stone in his *Biography* (p. 332). He insisted that there is a *necessary* connection between faith and practice. One is not only to believe the great truths of the Christian faith, but he is to conform his life to them.

In the same paragraph Stone sees those who would impose their opinions upon others as essentials as mischief makers: "They present us with their explanation of scripture doctrine, their dogmas, and gravely tell us, "here are the essentials of religion, to which you must subscribe, or be damned!!'"

It is noteworthy that he says this along with his definition of a Christian, as if he too had been beset by definitions too severe. He goes on to say this: "We must carefully distinguish between believing fundamental scripture truths, and any explanation of them by fallible men." Two pages over he stresses it further: *We must not forget our important distinction between believing a scripture truth, and any fallible explanation of it.*

This is the genius of the reformation led by Stone and Campbell. We unite on what the Bible actually says, what is *expressly* stated, especially in reference to the fundamentals of the faith. We allow liberty of opinion when it comes to deducing conclusions from what is expressly stated. There is often a big difference between what Scripture says and what somebody says it says. But that is OK, Stone concedes, so long as he is not pushy about such opinions.

Alexander Campbell calls the following definition his "favorite and

oft-repeated": *A Christian is one that habitually believes all that Christ says, and habitually does all that he bids him.* (*Mill. Harb.,* 1837, 566)

This definition grew out of the criticism he received from the now famous Lunenburg Letter in which he allowed that there must be unimmersed Christians in the sects. In that letter he gave a definition for a Christian that is better known than the one above, but we repeat it here: "But who is a Christian? I answer, Every one that believes in his heart that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the Son of God; repents of his sins, and obeys him in all things according to his measure of knowledge of his will." (*Mill. Harb.,* 1837, p. 411)

To recognize that one may *habitually* obey Christ even when his knowledge is defective in some areas is to face up to what is obvious. It is true of us all. We are all ignorant about some things, and so our obedience is less than perfect. If we would but *habitually* obey "in all things according to his measure of knowledge of his will," we could lay claim to the name Christian, and it is reasonable to suppose that there can be no other basis for unity and fellowship.

In the context of Campbell's first definition (*Mill. Harb.,* 1837, p. 565) he warns against judging those "who would die for Christ" because they have not been immersed, perhaps because they do not yet understand. They often show piety and Christ-likeness that is lacking in those who would judge them. He says frankly that he expects to see such ones in heaven. And this comes from one who has championed baptism by immersion as much as any churchman in history.

The last definition I give here comes from Thomas Campbell in his *Declaration and Address.* His great statement about the nature of the church also defines a Christian.

"The Church of Christ upon earth is essentially, intentionally, and constitutionally one; consisting of all those in every place that profess their faith in Christ and obedience to him in all things according to the Scriptures, and that manifest the same by their tempers and conduct, and none else; as none else can be truly and properly called Christians."

This is the most demanding definition of all, both for the church and a Christian. Campbell is saying that a church is not really a Church of Christ unless it bears the likeness of Jesus in the lives of its members. How many churches would this leave out? And who may be "properly called" a Christian? One who obeys Christ in all things "according to the Scriptures" (not necessarily the opinions of men), and who exemplify Christ in temperament and conduct.

We can learn from our fathers in the faith to avoid a false emphasis and to point to what is really crucial in being a Christian. — *the Editor*

Pilgrimage of Joy . . . No. 45

STILL MORE DRAMA AT HARVARD

W. Carl Ketcherside

Our last episode found me at Harvard, and a more unlikely or less qualified individual had probably never graced the premises there in the long history of the Divinity School which was set up in 1816. Nevertheless, Dr. Joseph Fletcher who had written the controversial book "Situation Ethics" heard that I was there and sent me an invitation to join him in his class on "Verbal Tools in Situation Ethics," at the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge.

I confess that I went with a warped preconceived notion of the kind of person who would produce such a liberal theological volume as he had turned out, and which was sparking all kinds of attack from the religious community. I fully expected to find a gay young "swinger" of about thirty-five years of age, with long hair and a beard, dressed in hippie garb, smoking a pipe, and wisecracking his way through class at every turn. You can imagine my surprise when I found a grandfatherly type, clean-shaven with a short haircut, and wearing a conventional suit of rather somber gray. The truth is that he was attired much more conventionally than I was.

The class consisted mostly of students for the Episcopal clergy, and it was obvious from looking at them, what a wide degree of variance that hoary fellowship tolerated. I had "cut my eye teeth" on the works of men from the Episcopalian clergy system — Alan Cole, John R. W. Stott, Michael Green, and J. I. Packer, all of whom were part of the "Evangelical Fellowship of the Anglican Communion." Their knowledge of and emphasis upon the word of God was a far cry from some of the wild ideas of these young men. I was thrilled to be among them and to affirm my faith not only in the need for a revelation but in the revelation given to meet that need.

Dr. Fletcher proved to be both modest and gracious. He introduced me to the class of about forty and invited me to participate during the two-hour session. He asked me for my definition of *agape,* which he laughingly suggested might need to be defined for modern secular man. He defined it simply as "active concern" for others. We discussed the implications of it, and talked about the seeming difference between Paul's theology and that of our Lord. He was quite convinced that, in going to the Greek world, Paul placed certain elements in the message that Jesus never intended. I was quite convinced of the opposite. It made for an interesting exchange. I remained behind with the students to talk and answer questions after he had left the room. It was a morning well-spent.

That evening a group of students under the banner of the Students for a Democratic Society, all slanted toward Marxism, occupied the University Hall and ejected the deans and administrators, and locked them out of their offices. They rifled drawers and files, and obtained some secret and classified materials and documents which began to appear in *Old Mole,* the appropriately named underground newspaper. The Harvard authorities tried to negotiate with them all next day to get them to abandon the building. The students were adamant and flushed with a sense of victory, and they had no success. They filed a list of grievances which they sent to Dr. Nathan Pusey, president of the institution.

Between three and four o'clock the next morning several hundred police moved in and stormed the place. They used only such force as was necessary, but they dragged the students bouncing down the stairs, cursing and screaming obscenities, and herded them into buses commandeered as "paddy wagons" and hauled them off to various and sundry jails. Just as they hoped it would, their forcible arrest created a real furor at the school and almost the entire student body rebelled. It was apparent that they had been looking for an incident which would spark an uproar.

I sat in on a meeting of the faculty and students of the divinity school, called to determine the policy they should pursue and the direction they should take. Richard Niebuhr presided as a representative of the administration. Harvey Cox was present as a kind of strolling ambassador and mediator. The student president was a radical revolutionary. He was dressed in a bizarre costume which made him look as if he had just drifted in from a reservation. He had a necklace of bear claws around his neck and a ring in one ear. One student suggested it should have been in his nose. He was thoroughly committed to overthrow of the existing order. When the shouting subsided he made the proposal that they seize the Divinity School, Andover Hall and the World Religion Center, and hold them "until hell freezes over" or student rights were recognized. Another took the floor and said he was glad to learn that he believed in hell, because he had been denying its existence up until now. Finally enough quiet was obtained to take a vote. The more conservative element won by such an overwhelming majority that the leader and a small group of cohorts stamped out of the hall.

Harvard Yard was filled with milling students. There were a lot of young agitators present who were not students and had no connection with the school. Communist slogans and literature were everywhere. Most of it seemed to favor Castro and Chairman Mao. It must have been already printed and rushed in on heels of the revolt. "The Albatross," a hard rock band, set up on the steps of Memorial Church and banged and howled, adding to the general din and confusion. Shortly after noon Dr. Pusey appeared. He walked through the milling crowd like the children of

Israel did through the Red Sea. He paid no attention to the jeers and catcalls, and to the occasional obscenities. He was as cool as a cucumber. And that coolness won the battle. In a few days the condition had subsided and gradually things returned to normal.

I conducted small group meetings in various homes and estates while in the area. On Monday night I was at the Wellington home in Mattapan; on Tuesday night in the Edmonds home in Billerica; on Wednesday night in the Van Voorhis home in Bedford, and on Thursday in the Hill home in Medfield. In everyone of these people prominent in various circles met for discussion of the word of God and their lives. On Friday morning I met with a gathering of ladies at the Kaplan home in Bedford. At this I spoke about our great hope through the resurrection of Jesus. On Friday night some 200 people gathered for a farewell meeting in the auditorium of Bedford High School. It was a great time of rejoicing in the Lord.

On July 19 the papers heralded the death of Mary Jo Kopechne. She was in an automobile which went off a bridge on Chappaquiddick Island, Massachusetts. The circumstances of her death were very suspicious and it seemed that a blanket was thrown over the investigation. It has dogged the steps of Senator Edward Kennedy ever since, and will undoubtedly play a part in the future of any bid he may make for the presidency. There are too many unexplained aspects of it to sweep under the rug.

On July 20, 21 Neil Armstrong stepped from the lunar module Eagle to become the first man to walk on the surface of the moon. We hurried home to watch it on television. As I sat in our living room and beheld those first "bunny-hops" I was seized with a feeling that things would never be the same. We were entering another stage of man's existence. It would be like the Stone Age, the Iron Age, the Machine Ages. The Space Age marked another milestone in human progress. It would require a "new man for our time" as Elton Trueblood came to put it.

On July 3-5, 1969, Nell and I went to West Islip, New York, for the Fourth Annual Unity Forum. West Islip was a dream that did not really become an actuality. It began as an Exodus movement. A number of Texas people were transferred at the same time to the northeast where they expected to become the nucleus of a thriving congregation and the seedbed from which to start others all over the New England States. It ended in disillusionment. The people were no different in the new location than they had been in Texas, and in some cases, that was not good. But the unity meeting was great.

It brought together Dwain Evans, Leroy Garrett, Robert Fife, Robert Shaw, J. Harold Thomas, Floyd Rose, Arthur W.Boone and myself. Floyd Rose, an outstanding black brother from Toledo, Ohio literally stole the show. He told about his work as a mere boy with Marshall Keeble, and how they were not allowed to stay in the homes of white brethren in the

meetings. He talked about a rope through the middle aisle to separate the two races and told how a black preacher took the confession of the blacks who came down, and a white preacher did the same for the whites. Half the audience was weeping unashamedly when he finished. It was clear to see that Churches of Christ had a miserable record to answer for on their treatment of the race question. Nell and I went to New York City with Don Haymes and his dear wife and saw the frightful conditions under which they labored for the Lord.

It was about this time a new little magazine was launched which was to have an effect far beyond its size. It was called *Integrity*. The editor was Hoy Ledbetter, a tremendous and capable brother. He was also fearless as one needs to be who undertakes such a work of faith in spite of the opposition of the entrenched forces of the establishment. The first issue contained articles by Dean Thoroman, John Smith, David Elkins, and Frank Rester. The paper drew fire from its very beginning because it dealt with subjects which had always been concealed by the church, but it has survived to this day.

I had gone for "Inspiration Week" to Northwest Christian College at Eugene, Oregon. As soon as my plane landed I was whisked away to a student lounging place called Carriage Trade Coffee House where I was due to be on a call-in program on the radio any time. I went to the college and had lunch with the football team and found that four of them had been meeting every night for prayer. They agreed to set up a meeting for me with the student body of the University of Oregon next evening when I finished speaking for the Christian College. About 325 persons assembled and sat on the floor when I walked into the great Sigma Chi lounge. I began by divesting myself of any sectarian label and appeared before them as simply one of the fellowship of the unashamed. As I talked and answered questions an emotional wave swept over these young people, some of whom had been guilty of gross sins. It continued far into the night on the outside of the building, with weeping and prayers.

It was August 19-21 when I went to the Rocky Mountain Men's Roundup which was held at Como, Colorado, far up in the mountains. It was at Rocking-R ranch and 300 men were present. Most of them stayed over and slept in the bunks at the camp. Present with me were James DeForest Murch who deplored camping out and did not stay to the close, and Don DeWelt who did like it. The latter had been on a mission to Australia, and was on his way home. The slides he brought with him added much to the meeting. I spoke on fellowship each morning and night and the men ate it up. In spite of incessant rain which made it unseasonably chilly we had a great time and a beautiful meeting.

It seems as if the Spirit of the Lord is more apparent in some gatherings than in others. I can testify to His presence in the meeting with these men, many of whom came from ranches and farms. They truly loved the Lord.

A New Kind of Sin . . .

WHAT WE ARE TO PREACH AND WHERE?

There is a new kind of sin going on among us. I say new in that it is new for sin, which has a way of being ancient, while this sin is of this generation. It is a special kind of sin committed by an occasional Church of Christ minister, *the sin of preaching to a Christian Church.* It is an odd kind of sin, for one would suppose that anyone who dares to preach could preach anywhere, and I do mean *anywhere,* with no exceptions, including a Christian Church, or a Church of Christ for that matter.

But not so according to one "conservative" journal that comes to our house. The offender this time is one William S. Banowsky, one-time president of Pepperdine and now president of Oklahoma University. Bill is guilty of preaching to a Christian Church, and he did not, according to the editor, "discuss the difference between the teaching and practice of Christian Churches and churches of Christ."

This is an interesting kind of transgression in the light of scripture, for there the dean of all gospel preachers says, "I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified" (1 Cor. 2:2). Again he says, "Woe to me if I do not preach the gospel" (1 Cor. 9:16), and in Gal. 1:8 he says that even an angel of heaven would be accursed if he preached any gospel other than what had been proclaimed by the apostles.

Now what about this business of preaching on the difference between the Christian Church and Church of Christ? What kind of gospel is that? How many souls will it save? How many hurting people will it lift up? Besides, *which* Christian Church and *which* Church of Christ, and *what* differences? Why bother people with all that?

Our brother editor needs to consider the greatest story ever told, Jesus Christ and him crucified. When *any* of his brothers is sharing the good news with anybody anywhere, he should rejoice, even if it is done in strife (see Philip. 1:18 where Paul says *Christ is proclaimed and I rejoice,* even when preached in pretense). Our brother needs to count his blessings, for Bill Banowsky almost certainly does not preach in pretense.

The Texas editor complains because Bill did not preach against instrumental music and the missionary society, at least one of which "corrupts the worship," which is a rather severe judgment. My study of scripture indicates that it is a corrupt *heart* that makes for corrupt worship, such as in Jer. 7.

For one to "preach" on things like organs and societies is to go beyond what is written. Since when is a man's loyalty to be measured by what the scriptures say nothing about? Why not judge a man on the grounds that Paul would judge him: *Christ is proclaimed and I rejoice!* Behind some editorial desks men rejoice only if a "thing" is condemned — an organ, or communion cups, or Sunday School classes.

When Bill Banowsky, or anybody else, preaches Christ, I will join Paul and rejoice. Lifting up Jesus is the best way to set all things right, for all change must begin in the heart. I have no interest in being anti-liberal, anti-Communism, anti-denominational, or *anti* anvthing else in the pulpit. Let us give the people the scriptures. *To the word and to the testimony!* is still a worthy cry.

But the editor puts Banowsky in the worst possible light, in the same class with Carl Ketcherside and Leroy Garrett, who have been doing this kind of sin all along. If we are condemned for it, as we are, being "untouchables" as the editor puts it, then Bill Banowsky ought not be allowed to get by with it. "Do you have one standard by which you measure Ketcherside and Garrett," asks the editor, "and another by which you measure Dr. Banowsky?" Then he lays it on, revealing that he really means business: "Either embrace Ketcherside and Garrett and quit looking down your self-righteous noses at them, or repudiate Dr. William S. Banowsky and relegate him as you have Ketcherside and Garrett to the realm of 'untouchables.'"

I do not take this to mean that he wants Carl and me to be embraced, but Banowsky to be repudiated. There is one thing that he clears up for me. I was aware that there are some "who are somewhat" who look down their noses at us. But I did not know what kind of noses they were.

But it really does not matter all that much. Noses or not, if he who was dead and now lives reaches forth and touches me, that is enough. And noses or not, if our brothers *preach the gospel* and *teach the healthful words of the Lord Jesus* we should rejoice.

And *anywhere! — the Editor*

Whoso would be a man must be a nonconformist. To be great is to be misunderstood. — *Emerson*

BOOK NOTES

The Bible in its Literary Milieu is an interesting, helpful collection of articles by 25 scholars representing all areas of Biblical study. Since the Bible was written in a culture and literary context much different from our own, this book helps one to understand the Bible better by looking at it in the light of that context. There are essays on inspiration, poetry, textual criticism, symbolism, archaeology. Albright's "The Antiquity of Mosaic Law" and Lambert's "A New Look at the Babylonian Background of Genesis" are samples of the goodies. If you are willing to work at it and not simply read casually, this book will really teach you something, and at today's prices its 450 pages are a bargain at 12.95, postpaid.

Lectures in Systematic Theology by Henry C. Thiessen is for the more serious student that likes to delve into weightier theological questions, and this one covers them all, systematically: theism, nature of Scripture, nature of God, angels, man, salvation, church, end time. This book, by one of today's noted theologians, was tested by 30 years of classroom teaching. So here is your chance to go to seminary at home. 13.95 postpaid.

History is a favorite study of our readers, and *A Short History of the Early Church* by Harry Boer, which starts with Jesus and goes to the seven ecumenical councils, is a favorite. After describing the world of the early church it goes on to tell of the rise and spread of the church, the persecutions, the heresies like Gnosticism, the formation of canon, Constantine and Augustine, and the great controversies, all quick and to the point. 4.50 postpaid.

If you want the inside story on spiritualism (talking with the dead), then read *The Challening Counterfeit,* by a former medium, 2.40 postpaid. And if you have not looked into the riches of archaeology, which you should do, then a convenient way to do so is in James Kelso's *An Archaeologist Looks at the Gospels,* who puts life into dry bones as he looks at the ministry of Jesus in the light of where he lived and worked, a culture far more advanced than we have supposed. 3.50 postpaid.

Ernie Campbell not only preaches sermons that other preachers would do well to preach, but he inspires anyone with his sharp, resourceful, challenging lessons. We highly recommend *Locked in a Room with Open Doors,* the title of one of the chapters that will really make you think. But "The Man Who Left Too Soon," which is about Peter, will do as much. Ernie always relates his message to the *now.* 3.95 postpaid.

Two of our bound volumes are in short supply, but we can still send you four: *The Restoration Mind* (1971-72) 4.95; *The Word Abused* (1975-76) 5.95; *Principles of Unity and Fellowship* (1977) and *The Ancient Order* (1978) 5.50 each. We expect the bound volume for last year to be ready anytime.

The pre-publication price on Walter Scott's *Evangelist* (10 vols.) for 80.00 ends this summer, so you should reserve your set with us now, but send no money. You will be billed when the set is sent in the fall. Regular price is 100.00.

READERS' EXCHANGE

Add another church to your list of those who are sponsoring a boat people family. We have a Vietnam family of six — *Numa V. Crowder, Church of Christ, 615 S. Ward, Macomb, Il. 61455*

I have passed around several old issues of *Restoration Review* and have had an overwhelming response concerning the relevance of your articles and a burning desire to hear more. Therefore, we encourage you to continue feeding us. — *David Young, Louisville, Ky.*

(If others are willing to pass along back issues of this journal, we will send you 18 different numbers for 3.00, postpaid — *Ed.*)

I am thankful for your witness, your wise and well chosen topics of discussion. I pray your voice may be heard loud and strong throughout Christendom. I continue to pray for unity among God's people in the divided state of world affairs. Nothing is more needed. — *Rachel Howard, Anderson, In.*

I have a sister who quotes you religiously. She says that we cannot prove that instrumental music and dancing are sins. My heart is broken. She went so far as to say that we can break bread on any day of the week. . *Name Withheld*

(If any one believes that instrumental music in the assembly is a sin, or that dancing is, then to her it would be (Rom. 14:23), but we must recognize that these are matters of personal scruple or opinion upon which devoted believers differ, and so "Let each one be fully persuaded in his own mind" (Rom. 14:5). Perhaps your heart is broken because your sister has departed from Church of Christ tradition more than from what the Bible actually teaches. Your heart should break when your sister approves of the *real* sins, as listed by Jesus in Mk. 7:21-23, such as covetousness, evil thoughts, and pride. As for the frequency of the Supper, we do not seem to give proper place to 1 Cor. 11:25 "As often as you drink it, do it in remembrance of me." Should we offer objection if a church should break bread *every* day so long as it is in memory of him whom we all love? — Ed.?

Restoration Review came yesterday and I took time out to read it, and one article, to me at least, was very outstanding, and I just wanted to tell you so. "Let's Get Married" was a masterpiece, and I'm thinking about my grandchildren getting married. I have a dear uncle who tried to "join" (that's a no-no also) the Church of Christ, but they found it hard to get interested where they were, so they finally ended up in the Church of God, baptized and everything. But they have a piano, and for the life of me I can't think they are going to hell. — *Florence Bankston, Tulsa, Ok.*

(When I was in Denver recently a couple introduced themselves as the ones who had the experiences I described in the article referred to above. It was one of their parents, a minister, who reported it to me by letter. If we are not more sensitive to the feelings of our youth (and this means more than hiring a youth minister!) we will continue to lose them, not so much to other churches as to the world. — *Ed.*)

It would be truly wonderful if all believers in Jesus Christ could unite together and show a united witness to the world. As for instrumental music, it doesn't matter to me so long as we have God in our church. When my non-instrument brethren invite me to their revivals, I go and they are glad when I attend, but when I invite them to my church, they can't attend. I wish there was some way to bring us all back together. — *Donald Revis, Hubbard, Oh.*

(This brother is a member of a Christian Church that reaches all the way back to the old Mahoning Baptist Association that formed the nucleus for the Disciples of Christ under the Campbells. Many of the old pioneers, including Walter Scott, preached there. It is appropriate that he continue to dream of a united Movement. There is a way, already charted by our Lord, and that is the way of love. There is no way to keep people separated if they love one another even as He has loved us. — *Ed.*)

OUR CHANGING WORLD

Two Christian Churches in Eugene, Oregon have an interesting history. A generation ago they were one church but split into two, and had two separate buildings. My correspondent, being comparatively new to the scene, is not sure why they split. But both groups recently sold their buildings, and they are now meeting in the same facility, though at